

REMARKS

Claims 9-12, 14, 17, 19, 20, and 23-45 are pending in this application, with claims 9-12, 23, 27, 32, and 37 being independent. Claims 23-45 have been withdrawn. Claims 9-12 have been amended, and claims 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 22 have been canceled.

Independent claims 11 and 12 and their dependent claims 14, 17, and 18-20 have been rejected as being indefinite. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to eliminate any confusion regarding the recited plural substrates. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 12, 14, 17, and 18-20 in view of these amendments.

Independent claim 9 has been rejected as being anticipated by JP 8-162269 and by Salerno (U.S. Patent No. 5,396,304). Claim 9 has also been rejected as being unpatentable over Salerno in view of Yoneda (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,340 B2). Claim 9 has been amended to recite the limitations of dependent claim 15, which had been rejected as being unpatentable over JP 8-162269 in view of Bando (U.S. Patent No. 5,276,999) and over Salerno in view of Yoneda and Bando.

Claim 9, as amended, recites a method of manufacturing a light emitting device including forming a light emitting element at a front surface of a substrate, polishing a back surface of the substrate by a chemical mechanical polishing means, and bonding a color filter at the polished back surface of the substrate. Neither JP 8-162269, Salerno, Bando, Yoneda, nor any proper combination of the four describes or suggests the polishing of the back surface of the substrate and the subsequent bonding of the color filter to the polished back surface.

JP8-162269 discloses a glass substrate 2, which the Examiner equates to the recited substrate, a set of layers 3, 4a-4e, and 6, which the Examiner equates to the recited light emitting element, and a color filter 1, which the Examiner equates to the recited color filter. JP8-162269 describes the color filter 1 being combined with the glass substrate 2. JP8-16229, however, does not describe or suggest "polishing a back surface of the substrate" and "bonding a color filter at the polished back surface of the substrate," as claimed.

Bando describes a polishing machine that may be used to polish a surface of a glass plate to produce a smooth and flat glass plate (col. 1, lines 6-9). Such a plate may be used in liquid

crystal display devices (col.1, line 10). However, Bando's general suggestion that the polishing machine may be used to provide a smooth and flat glass plate does not suggest or provide motivation for "polishing a *back surface* of the substrate" (emphasis added) and "bonding a color filter at the *polished back surface* of the substrate" (emphasis added), as claimed. Bando's general suggestion to polish a glass plate surface for use in liquid crystal display devices suggests, at best, that the front surface of the substrate should be polished, as is frequently done in liquid crystal display processing, to provide a smooth and planar surface that facilitates the fabrication of device structures on that surface (such as thin film transistors). Bando, however, does not describe or suggest polishing the back surface of the substrate as is desirable in order, for example, to improve the directivity of light emitted from an EL element.

Salerno and Yoneda are similarly deficient, as they do not even describe or suggest the polishing of substrates.

For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9.

Independent claim 10 has been rejected as being anticipated by Salerno (U.S. Patent No. 5,396,304) and as being unpatentable over Salerno in view of Yoneda. Claim 10 has been amended to recite the limitations of dependent claim 16, which had been rejected as being unpatentable over Salerno in view of Yoneda and further in view of Bando. Claim 10, as amended, recites "polishing a back surface of the substrate" and "bonding a color filter at the polished back surface of the substrate." For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9, neither Salerno, Yoneda, Bando, nor any combination of the three describes or suggests the recited polishing and bonding operations, and, therefore, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10.

Independent claims 11 and 12 have been rejected along with their dependent claims 14 and 20 as being unpatentable over Salerno in view of Yoneda. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to recite the limitations of dependent claims 13 and 18, respectively, which had also been rejected as being unpatentable over Salerno in view of Yoneda.

Claims 11 and 12, as amended, recite a method of manufacturing a light emitting device that includes “forming a *light emitting element*” (emphasis added) and “bonding an antireflection film or a polarization plate to the transparent substrate.” Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 and their dependent claims because neither Salerno, Yoneda, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a method of manufacturing a light emitting device including forming a light emitting element and bonding an antireflection film or polarization plate to a transparent substrate.

The Office Action states that “Salerno discloses that there may be a polarization plate 1002 bonded (‘secured’) to the transparent color filter substrate 1006 (Fig. 37, col. 37, lines 8-19).” However, contrary to the Examiner’s contention, the first polarizing filter 1002 of Salerno is not described as being in a light emitting device, as claimed. Rather, the first polarizing filter 1002 is described as being part of the liquid crystal transmission display structure shown in Fig. 37. Salerno describes a light emitting or EL display structure 1200, but does not describe or suggest that the EL display structure 1200 includes an antireflection film or a polarization plate, as claimed.

Yoneda describes a color display apparatus that includes EL elements. However, Yoneda does not describe or suggest bonding an antireflection film or a polarization plate to the transparent substrate as claimed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12, and their dependent claims.

Dependent claims 17 and 20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Salerno in view of Yoneda and in view of Yoneda and Bando. Claims 17 and 20 depend from claims 11 and 12, respectively. For at least the same reasons described above with respect to claims 11 and 12, neither Yoneda, Salerno, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a method of manufacturing a light emitting device including forming a light emitting element and bonding an antireflection or a polarization plate to a transparent substrate. Bando is similarly deficient. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 20.

Applicant : Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.  
Serial No. : 09/841,156  
Filed : April 25, 2001  
Page : 8 of 8


Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-033001 / US4868

Enclosed is a check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Date: November 5, 2003

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

Respectfully submitted,

  
Scott R. Boalick  
Reg NO 42,337

John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640